

### REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

#### Double Patenting Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 - 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,240. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1- 17 of the instant application are broader than claims 1 - 17 of U. S. Patent No. 6,275,240, and include all of the claimed limitations of that patent.

Applicant submits the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the double patenting rejection.

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call John Ward at (408) 720-8300, x237.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 05/21/2003



---

John P. Ward, Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300 x237